

DETAILED ACTION

The below rejection replaces the rejection of January 6, 2010 because the listing of claims rejected was inaccurate. The following is a corrected rejection with appropriate claims indicated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Japanese Patent Publication 9-197394 (Akira et al.) or Stadtmueller (U.S. Patent 5,891,297) in view of Mizutani et al. (U.S. Patent 6,258,666) in view of Frederick (U.S. Patent 4,373,611). Akira et al. and Stadtmueller each show a method for peeling a film from a display panel comprising: peeling off an end of a film (Akira et al., element 1; Stadtmueller, element 28) that has been stuck on a display panel (Akira et al., element 2; Stadtmueller, element 32); fixing the peeled end of the film to a roller (Akira et al., element 4; Stadtmueller, element 22) that is adjacent to or in contact with a panel face of the display panel; and peeling off the film from the display panel by rotationally driving the roller (Akira et al., English Abstract and partial translation; Stadtmueller,

column 3, lines 48-66, column 4, lines 40-47). The references fail to show an internal motor for the roller.

Frederick teaches that a roller can be driven by either an internal or external motor (column 1, lines 23-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the external motor of Akira et al. with an internal motor because Frederick teaches the two to be functionally equivalent alternate expedients. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add a motor to the invention of Stadtmueller to reduce the effort required of an operator and Frederick teaches that making the motor either internal or external is a mechanical design choice.

3. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Publication 9-197394 (Akira et al.) in view of Frederick as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Mizutani et al. (U.S. Patent 6,258,666). As shown in paragraph 2 above, Akira et al. shows the invention of the independent claim. Akira et al. also show the roller to have an effective length longer than the short side of the display panel but fails to show the contact plate.

Mizutani et al. shows a peeling roller for removing a film from an electronic substrate wherein a roller, 5, and a contact plate, 6, are pressed by a mechanism to sandwich the film, 4, therebetween (See Figs. 1, 10b, 10c; column 3, lines 26-35; column 4, lines 15-22; column 5, lines 14-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the adhesive patches of

Akira et al. with the contact plate of Mizutani et al. because Mizutani et al. shows the contact plate to be a functionally equivalent alternate expedient to the adhesive patches with the advantage that the film will not be contaminated with adhesive (column 3, lines 36-39).

4. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stadtmueller (U.S. Patent 5,891,297) in view of Frederick as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Mizutani et al. (U.S. Patent 6,258,666). As shown in paragraph 2 above, Akira et al. shows the invention of the independent claim. Stadtmueller also shows the roller to have an effective length longer than the short side of the display panel but fails to show the contact plate.

Mizutani et al. shows a peeling roller for removing a film from an electronic substrate wherein a roller, 5, and a contact plate, 6, are pressed by a mechanism to sandwich the film, 4, therebetween (See Figs. 1, 10b, 10c; column 3, lines 26-35; column 4, lines 15-22; column 5, lines 14-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the groove of Stadtmueller with the contact plate of Mizutani et al. because Mizutani et al. shows the contact plate to be a functionally equivalent alternate expedient to the groove with the advantage that the film will not be secured without the chance of slipping out of the groove.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Akira et al. or Stadtmueller in view of Frederick and Mizutani et al. as applied to claim 3

above, and further in view of McQuiston. The references show the claimed subject matter except for the toggle clamps. McQuiston shows an apparatus with a bar, 36, for rolling up a strip of material, 20; a contact plate, 38, to press the strip of material against the bar; and bolts, 37, outside of the effective length of the rolling bar to force the contact plate and rolling bar together (See Fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add bolts or any other conventional connecting means, such as toggle clamps to the apparatus of the references as combined to provide the force for securing the contact plate against the roller because McQuiston shows these connectors to be effective to maintaining the roller and contact plate together. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to place the toggle clamps outside of the effective length of the roller so as to allow the film to be inserted without being stopped by the connectors, such as shown by McQuiston.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark A. Osele whose telephone number is 571-272-1235. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:00-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Philip Tucker can be reached on 571-272-1095. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mark A Osele/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791
April 7, 2010